

**Certificate of Notice Page 1 of 2**  
United States Bankruptcy Court  
Eastern District of Pennsylvania

In re:  
John C. Flagler  
Debtor

Case No. 17-16997-ref  
Chapter 7

**CERTIFICATE OF NOTICE**

District/off: 0313-4

User: Keith  
Form ID: pdf900

Page 1 of 1  
Total Noticed: 4

Date Rcvd: Apr 06, 2018

Notice by first class mail was sent to the following persons/entities by the Bankruptcy Noticing Center on Apr 08, 2018.

db	+John C. Flagler,	1580 Clearfield Road,	Wind Gap, PA 18091-9744
cr	+Francis E. Templin,	6093 Old Rt. 22,	Bernville, PA 19506-8455
NONE	+Robert D. Densmore,	727 Limestone St.,	Catasauqua, PA 18032-2335

Notice by electronic transmission was sent to the following persons/entities by the Bankruptcy Noticing Center.  
cr +E-mail/PDF: gecsed@recoverycorp.com Apr 07 2018 01:42:19 Synchrony Bank,  
c/o PRA Receivables Management, LLC, PO Box 41021, Norfolk, VA 23541-1021

TOTAL: 1

\*\*\*\*\* BYPASSED RECIPIENTS \*\*\*\*\*

NONE.

TOTAL: 0

Addresses marked '+' were corrected by inserting the ZIP or replacing an incorrect ZIP.  
USPS regulations require that automation-compatible mail display the correct ZIP.

Transmission times for electronic delivery are Eastern Time zone.

**I, Joseph Speetjens, declare under the penalty of perjury that I have sent the attached document to the above listed entities in the manner shown, and prepared the Certificate of Notice and that it is true and correct to the best of my information and belief.**

**Meeting of Creditor Notices only (Official Form 309): Pursuant to Fed. R. Bank. P. 2002(a)(1), a notice containing the complete Social Security Number (SSN) of the debtor(s) was furnished to all parties listed. This official court copy contains the redacted SSN as required by the bankruptcy rules and the Judiciary's privacy policies.**

Date: Apr 08, 2018

Signature: /s/Joseph Speetjens

---

**CM/ECF NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

The following persons/entities were sent notice through the court's CM/ECF electronic mail (Email) system on April 6, 2018 at the address(es) listed below:

MICHAEL H KALINER	mhkaliner@gmail.com,	pa35@ecfcbis.com
MICHAEL H KALINER	on behalf of Trustee	MICHAEL H KALINER mhkaliner@gmail.com, pa35@ecfcbis.com
PAUL EDWARD TRAINOR	on behalf of Debtor John C. Flagler	trainorlawoffices@gmail.com
RALPH J. BELLAFATTO	on behalf of Robert D. Densmore	ralph@bellafatto.com,
	margaret@bellafatto.com	
REBECCA ANN SOLARZ	on behalf of Creditor	BAYVIEW LOAN SERVICING, LLC bkgroup@kmlawgroup.com
United States Trustee	USTPRegion03.PH.ECF@usdoj.gov	

TOTAL: 6

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In re: JOHN C. FLAGLER, : Case No. 17-16997REF  
Debtor : Chapter 7

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 6 day of April, 2018, upon my consideration of the motion filed by Francis E. Templin (“Mr. Templin”) for an examination of Debtor pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2004 (the “2004 Motion”) and the response thereto filed by Debtor, and after a hearing on April 4, 2018 on the 2004 Motion, during which hearing I entered a Bench Order denying the 2004 Motion based upon my statements made in Court, in particular pursuant to my finding and conclusion that because the disputes between the parties arose in the midst of litigation of contested matters, the proper procedural vehicle for Mr. Templin to obtain the information he was seeking was through the discovery rules, not through a 2004 Motion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Bench Order I entered on April 4, 2018, denying the 2004 Motion IS HEREBY REAFFIRMED.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE COURT



RICHARD E. FEHLING

United States Bankruptcy Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> The April 4, 2018 hearing covered five different contested matters. I entered two Bench Orders during this hearing denying Mr. Templin’s 2004 Motion. The first Bench Order, which was entered before most of the remaining contested matters had been heard, denied the 2004 Motion without prejudice to Mr. Templin’s ability to obtain the information he was seeking through discovery. The second Bench Order, which was entered after the remaining contested matters had been heard, denied the 2004 Motion without mentioning whether the denial was with or without prejudice. Because the second Bench Order was silent on whether it was entered with or without prejudice, it is interpreted to be without prejudice to Mr. Templin’s ability to obtain the information he was seeking through discovery, although all contested matters between the parties have now been heard and decided.